

Review Form 1.7

Journal Name:	Asian Journal of Education and Social Studies
Manuscript Number:	Ms_AJESS_104240
Title of the Manuscript:	RESTRUCTURING THE PUBLIC RELATIONS CAPACITY OF THE STATISTICS, INFORMATICS AND ENCRYPTION COMMUNICATION SERVICE IN SOUTH SULAWESI PROVINCE
Type of the Article	Original Research Article

General guideline for Peer Review process:

This journal's peer review policy states that **NO** manuscript should be rejected only on the basis of '**lack of Novelty**', provided the manuscript is scientifically robust and technically sound. To know the complete guideline for Peer Review process, reviewers are requested to visit this link:

(<https://www.journalajess.com/index.php/AJESS/editorial-policy>)

PART 1: Review Comments

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Compulsory REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is the manuscript important for scientific community? (Please write few sentences on this manuscript)</p> <p>2. Is the title of the article suitable? (If not please suggest an alternative title)</p> <p>3. Is the abstract of the article comprehensive?</p> <p>4. Are subsections and structure of the manuscript appropriate?</p> <p>5. Do you think the manuscript is scientifically correct?</p> <p>6. Are the references sufficient and recent? If you have suggestion of additional references, please mention in the review form.</p> <p>(Apart from above mentioned 6 points, reviewers are free to provide additional suggestions/comments)</p>	<p>Yes. But lack of citation affected the credibility of the research</p> <p>Yes. But the author the statistic part of the title was not thoroughly discussed in the study.</p> <p>Yes, the abstract all necessary elements.</p> <p>Moderate. The data collection was not vividly explain. For instance, as the author focused on qualitative analysis. It should be stated clear who were does that were interviewed, what were their view or opinion of the old model and new model). Likewise, based on the topic, the author should develop section in five on how the new model enhance public relations capacity of the statistics, informatics and encryption communication service (with subsections – considering the findings).</p> <p>The references were too small, with limited citations.</p>	
<p>Minor REVISION comments</p> <p>1. Is language/English quality of the article suitable for scholarly communications?</p>	<p>Yes</p>	
<p>Optional/General comments</p>	<p>The work generally is good, but can be amended, most especially to best fit the research topic and objectives</p>	

PART 2:

	Reviewer's comment	Author's comment (if agreed with reviewer, correct the manuscript and highlight that part in the manuscript. It is mandatory that authors should write his/her feedback here)
<p>Are there ethical issues in this manuscript?</p>	<p><i>(If yes, Kindly please write down the ethical issues here in details)</i></p>	

Review Form 1.7

Reviewer Details:

Name:	Oyerinde Oluyinka Moses
Department, University & Country	Top Gateway Institution, Nigeria